## REMARKS

The claims are again presented without amendment.

Claims 1 to 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maeng (U.S. 6,313,652). The rejection is again respectfully traversed.

It is fundamental that a rejection under section 102 requires that each and every feature of a claim as well as each and every function recited by the claimed features be found in a single reference. This is not the case with the subject rejection.

Claim 1 requires, for example, a single handler *coupled* to the first and second testers. Even assuming, without agreement, that the transferring member 40 be a handler, the transferring member of Maeng is not coupled to first and second testers. In fact, the transferring member 40 doesn't appear to be coupled to anything in figure 4.

Claims 2 to 17 depend from claim 1 and therefore define patentably over Maeng for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1.

In addition, claim 2 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the first tester be adapted to calibrate the second tester. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 3 further limits claim 2 by requiring that the second tester be adapted to submit a request for calibration to the first tester. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 4 further limits claim 2 by requiring that the first tester be adapted to calibrate the second tester at predetermined time intervals or when ambient temperature has changed by a predetermined amount. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 5 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the first test procedure comprise at least one of static and dynamic current and voltage tests, dynamic functional AC/DC tests, DC offset tests, AC timing relation tests, internal AC parametric tests, power supply current tests, leakage current tests, gain tests, and/or low speed digital pattern tests; and wherein the second test procedure comprises at least one of external AC parametric tests, signal-to-noise ratio tests, DSP-based AC tests, distortion tests, thermal soaks, RF tests, and/or high speed digital pattern tests with precision timing. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 6 further limits claim 1 by requiring that data be transmittable from the first tester to the second tester and/or from the second tester to the first tester. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 7 further limits claim 1 by requiring a multiplexer coupled to the first and second testers, wherein the multiplexer is adapted to multiplex the first and second test procedures on the first and second IC's. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is

shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 8 further limits claim 7 by requiring that the first and second IC's be in die form integral to a single wafer, wherein the apparatus further comprises a wafer probe simultaneously coupleable to the first and second IC's. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 9 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the first and second testers comprise low cost testers. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 10 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the first and second testers comprise high cost testers. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 11 further limits claim 1 by requiring that first IC's that fail the first test procedures be moved to the second tester for testing with the second test procedure. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 12 further limits claim 1 by requiring control circuitry coupled to the first tester and second tester and storage means coupled to the control circuitry, first tester and second tester. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 13 furtherlimits claim 12 by requiring that first and second IC test procedure result information be storable in the storage means with respect to first and second IC position. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 14 further limits claim 12 by requiring that the first and second IC's store identification information, wherein first and second IC test procedure result information is storable in the storage means with respect to the first and second IC identification information. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 15 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the apparatus be adapted to test the at least one first IC with the first tester first test procedure simultaneously while the at least one second IC is tested with the second tester second test procedure. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 16 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the first tester be indirectly coupled to the second tester by a host computer or host network. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 17 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the first tester be integral to the second tester. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 18 requires, among other features, a single handler coupled to the first and second testers, the first and second test procedures adapted to test at least some different IC parameters. The argument presented above with reference to claim 1 applies as well to this claim.

Claim 18 further requires a first environmental chamber coupled to the first tester and a second environmental chamber coupled to the second tester, wherein the first and

second test procedures comprise subjecting the first and second IC's to different environmental tests. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 19 requires, among other features, a single handler coupled to the first and second testers, wherein the first and second test procedures are adapted to test at least some different IC parameters, and wherein the first tester is integral to the handler. The argument presented above with reference to claim 1 applies as well to this claim.

Claim 20 depends from claim 19 and therefore defines patentably over Maeng for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 19.

Claim 21 requires, among other features, the step of coupling the first tester to the second tester. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claims 22 to 33 depend from claim 21 and therefore define patentably over Maeng for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 21.
Claim 22 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of calibrating the second tester with the first tester and/or calibrating the first tester with the second tester. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 23 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the calibrating be in response to a request for calibration from the first or second tester. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 24 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the first tester be adapted to calibrate the second tester at predetermined time intervals or when ambient temperature has changed by a predetermined amount. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 25 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of transmitting data from the first tester to the second tester and/or transmitting data from the second tester to the first tester. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 26 further limits claim 21 by requiring that the first test procedure comprise at least one of static and dynamic current and voltage tests, dynamic functional AC/DC tests, DC offset tests, AC timing relation tests, internal AC parametric tests, power supply current tests, leakage current tests, gain tests, and/or low speed digital pattern tests; and wherein the second test procedure comprises at least one of external AC parametric tests, signal-to-noise ratio tests, DSP-based AC tests,

distortion tests, thermal soaks, RF tests, and/or high speed digital pattern tests with precision timing. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 27 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of multiplexing the first and second test procedures on the first and second IC's. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 28 further limits claim 27 by requiring that the first and second IC's be in die form integral to a single wafer, wherein the method further comprises coupling a wafer probe simultaneously coupleable to the first and second IC's to perform the first and second test procedures. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 29 further limits claim 21 by requiring the steps of subjecting the first IC's to a first environmental test while performing the second test procedure and subjecting the second IC's to a second environmental test while performing the first test procedure, wherein the first environmental test is different from the second environmental test. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 30 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of moving first IC's that fail the first test procedures to the second tester for testing with the second test procedure. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

Claim 31 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of storing the first and second IC test procedure result information with respect to first and second IC position.

32. (previously presented) The method according to Claim 21, further comprising storing the first and second IC test procedure result information with respect to the first and second IC identification information. No such feature is found in Maeng either alone or in the combination as claimed. If the Examiner continues to allege that this feature is shown in figure 5 of Maeng, he is requested to indicate where in the specification this feature is disclosed.

Claim 33 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of simultaneously testing the second IC with the second test procedure while testing the first IC with the first test procedure. No such combination is taught or suggested by Maeng.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay M. Cantor
Reg. No. 19,9062
Tel.: (301) 424-0355
(972) 917-5653